

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 13-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and claim 16 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in the Disclosure.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS:**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 3, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Moriwaki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,258,480) (hereinafter, "Moriwaki").

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwaki as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Seiji (JP 60 124351).

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwaki as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morishita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,976,729).

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwaki in view of Morishita as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Seiji.

At page 7 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwaki in view of Seiji, as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Morishita.

Also at page 7 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwaki as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shibata et al. (EP 0 899 799 A2) (hereinafter, "Shibata").

The rejection of cancelled claim 16 is moot. Regarding the other claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Moriwaki, either alone, or in combination with the secondary references, fails to disclose or suggest, a layer having a thickness of 30  $\mu\text{m}$  to 100  $\mu\text{m}$  provided only on an outer surface of the bottom portion of the can, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Moriwaki discloses that a nickel layer of under 30  $\mu\text{m}$  is provide on the inside or outside faces of the battery (see, col. 5, lines 9-21, and col. 11, lines 45-58 of Moriwaki). Accordingly, instead of providing a layer only on an outer surface of the bottom portion of the can, Moriwaki provides the nickel layer on an entire surface of the can.

Based on the above, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Moriwaki. As the secondary references fail to overcome at least the above noted deficiency of Moriwaki, claims 2-10 and 13-15 are also patentably distinguishable over the applied reference and their combinations for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/21/2007

By: 

Seth S. Kim  
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510